REMARKS

The Advisory Action of March 9, 2010 has been received and carefully considered. A request for continued examination is hereby filed to have the amendment of February 22, 2010 entered and considered. In addition, Applicant hereby makes further amendments to the amendment of February 22, 2010.

In this further Amendment, Applicant has amended Claims 20, 27 and 44 to overcome the rejections and further specify the embodiments of the present invention. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been introduced by the amended claims. The new section (b) in Claim 20 is supported by the specification (see published specification US 2006/0233330, paragraph [0011], lines 3-7, and paragraph [0012], lines 1-2, 6-9 and 17-18). All claims are now present for examination and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the preceding amendments and the following comments.

First, Applicant would like to make certain corrections to the remarks in the response of February 22, 2010:

1. On page 11, lines 10 -- 12 of the February 22, 2010 response, the relevant sentence should be corrected as follows:

   "They failed to disclose or suggest the present invention's method of the resident (B-replier) opening for the access requesting visitor by means of a call made by the B-replier ~~the visitor~~ and caller-ID."

2. On page 13, lines 1 – 4 of the February 22, 2010 response, the relevant sentence should be corrected as follows:

   In addition, this telephone unit cannot possibly meet the marks of a B-replier, e.g. being a third party to which ~~whose~~ non-"registered" mobile phones can call to be granted access, or "an authorized person or a machine, other than said device, with authority to grant or deny access."

3. On page 14, lines 1 – 2 of the February 22, 2010 response, the relevant sentence should be corrected as follows:

"Otherwise, 21 or 21a ~~the mobile phone~~ cannot be called)"

4. On page 14, lines 3 – 4 from bottom of the February 22, 2010 response, the relevant sentence should be corrected as follows:

"Lee just simply and separately maintains respective group B entrance telephone and ~~system in~~ Martin/Hara system with all their limitations and disadvantages."

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a):

Claims 20, 26 – 28, 30 – 34, 36 – 37, 39, 41 – 42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Lee (US 7,065,196) in view of Hara (US 6,895,241). Claims 21 and 44 – 45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Lee in view of Hara and further in view of Martin (WO 00/35178). Claim 22 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Lee in view of Hara further in view of Trell (US 5,046,083). Claims 24 and 35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Lee in view of Hara and further in view of Trell (US 3,947,641). Claim 43 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Lee in view of Hara and further in view of Franz (US 20070229569).

Applicant traverses the rejection and respectfully submits that the embodiments of present-claimed invention as amended are not obvious over the cited references. In addition to the remarks submitted in the response of February 22, 2010, Applicant further submits that Hara abstract teaches "a person who wishes to take out a parcel ...", (see lines 5-6) ... when this person is a registered user ... (see lines 11-12) ... the door lock is released ... (see line 12). On line 5 from end, this person/user is defined as a resident. The abstract shows (as the amendment's comprehensive analysis) that only registered residents can (and really should be allowed to) take out parcel by a direct cellphone call. Hara will not provide any service for non-registered occasional visitors (see US

2006/0233330, [0003], line 5), which the present invention's B-replier can, since B-replier does not act on the caller-ID (numerical authentication) of the calling visitor, but rather, by conversation etc., can evaluate the visitor's "personal" authenticity. The B-replier itself will then call and give its caller-ID to the device for opening.

As pointed out in the specification of the present invention, in the very first lines of paragraph [0003], opening doors for registered ("preauthorized") visitors by their cellphones' caller-IDs, codelocks are mentioned. Paragraph [0003] also discussed problems of this type of systems because they do not work for occasional visitors and no possibility for a called party (which has to blindly open as soon as receiving a registered code/caller-ID) to make a final judgment, helpful in avoiding unlawful entry by using stolen codes/cellphones by non-registered visitors.

The mentioned WO 00/62521 deals with services by cellphones, and discusses i.e. the usage of their PIN/SIM numbers for code/card-lock access. On its page 18, lines 13-14, use of caller-ID from cellphones for such purposes appears (US counterpart patent 7,031,665 mentioned this on Col. 16, lines 20-22).

At the time of filing the present invention, Hara/Martin-like standard gadgets were readily available as off the shelf products. But since lacking a common trade-name like e.g. codelock, they are mentioned in paragraph [0003]. Thus, Martin/Hara-like caller-ID applications were known to a person of ordinary skill in the art. A person of ordinary skill in the art also knows that they could not solve the problem of occasional visitors. In addition, if add-on combined with group A/group B system, they just will work like a codelock etc. accessory.

The solution so far for occasional visitors was, as discussed in paragraph [0003], these very group A/B and hybrid systems, whose problems were not so much of function as of cost, complexity, vulnerability etc., were discussed in paragraphs [0003] - [0006]. The present invention solved all these problems with a new, well-working, useful and advantageous method.

It may finally be worth noting that, while Examiner's combination of Lee and Hara and each reference by themselves are quite complicated and expensive. They are merely constricted objects adding complexity and costs for residences and residents thereof without providing the advantages of the present invention. The smart and novel method of the present invention directly provides great economical, material and feature advantages as well as resourcefulness.

In summary, none of the cited referenced alone or in combination suggests or discloses the present invention as claimed. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

Having overcome all outstanding grounds of rejection, the application is now in condition for allowance, and prompt action toward that end is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

Date: April 1, 2010
(202) 638-6666
400 Seventh Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Atty. Dkt. No.: P70919US0

By _____
John C. Holman
Registration No. 22,769